

25X1A8a

Approved For Release 2000/09/14 : CIA-RDP78-00915R001200120002-3

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2000/09/14 : CIA-RDP78-00915R001200120002-3

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



COMMUNIST REVISIONISM AND DISSIDENCE (3)

Summary No. 2797

7 September 1960

Prepared by

Foreign Documents Division
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
2430 E St., N. W., Washington 25, D. C.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

W A R N I N G

THIS MATERIAL CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE
OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE ESPIONAGE LAWS,
TITLE 18, USC, SECS. 793 AND 794, THE TRANSMISSION OR REVELATION OF
WHICH IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW.

CONFIDENTIAL

COMMUNIST REVISIONISM AND DISSIDENCE (3)

This report contains material on Communist revisionism and dissidence as reflected in Communist and non-Communist sources. The latest source date used herein is 3 August 1960.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Part 1. USSR	1
CPSU Struggle Against Revisionism	1
Part 2. Far East	4
I. China	4
Revisionism Among Intellectuals	4
Enduring Universals Over Politics	4
Contradictions and Law of	
Unity of Opposition	9
II. Indonesia	11
Party Reaction to Soviet-Chinese	
Controversy	11
III. North Vietnam	15
Press Maintains Neutral Position on	
Sino-Soviet Differences	15
Part 3. Eastern Europe	17
I. East Germany	17
Reaction to West German SPD Theories;	
Revisionist Tendencies in Art, Literature,	
Natural Science	17

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

	<u>Page</u>
II. Hungary	22
Symptoms of Revisionism Continue	22
III. Yugoslavia	24
Yugoslavs Refute Allegations in Soviet Article	24
Part 4. Western Europe	26
I. Denmark	26
Danish Dissident Communists Criticize Bucharest Declaration	26
II. France	27
Unified Socialist Party of France Attacked by Communist Official	27
III. Italy	29
1. New Italian Revisionist Monthly Attacks PCI and PCF	29
2. Revisionist Giolitti Edits Book on Communism in Europe	31

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Part 1. USSR

CPSU Struggle Against Revisionism

"The struggle against revisionism is one of the most important tasks of all Communist and Workers Parties," states I. Negodayev in his book, Sovremennyy Revizionizm -- Oruzhiye Reaktsii (Contemporary Revisionism Is the Weapon of Reaction), Moscow, 1959. Accordingly, nearly all official organs of the CPSU and the Communist Parties of the union republics contain, at one time or another, articles intended to expose "the insidiousness of revisionism."

Kommunist Ukrainy, chief theoretical organ of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, in its issue No 6, June 1960, publishes an article by I. Kovalev entitled "The Growth of the Leading Role of the CPSU During the Period of the Extensive Building of Communism." The author states: "...The June 1957 Central Committee plenum, following Leninist directions, unmasked and ideologically routed the antiparty group of Malenkov, Kaganovich, Molotov, Bulganin, and Shepilov, which, while employing the lowest devices of factional, schismatic struggles, attempted to destroy party unity, prevent the fulfillment of the 20th Party Congress decrees, and turn the party and nation away from the Leninist path. Having defeated the antiparty group, the party united even more closely around the Central Committee under the banner of Marxism-Leninism. Our party is now monolithic and unified as never before and is capable of solving the great problems involved in constructing a Communist society. The most shining affirmation of this fact is the victories gained by the Soviet people under party leadership in the first and second year of the Seven-Year Plan.

"The Soviet people, in building Communism, are traveling along new, unexplored paths. Marxist-Leninist theory plays an especially great role in such circumstances, for it gives clearness of purpose and certitude of victory. By its creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory, the party illuminates the path of practical activity in the struggle for Communism. The statements of contemporary revisionists are shown to be pitiable in regard to their view that the building of socialism can be accomplished without the leadership of the revolutionary Marxist party. The purpose of these statements is to disarm the working class and all workers in their struggle against the exploitative system...."

Kommunist, chief theoretical organ of the CPSU, in its issue No 10, July 1960, publishes an article by F. Konstantinov and Kh. Momdzhyan entitled "Dialectics and the Present Day," which attacks the "tendency of some political leaders to regard the course of peaceful coexistence and the struggle for disarmament as a deviation from the Marxist-Leninist position in the class struggle." The authors criticize those "striving to sow distrust in the rightness of the decisions of the 20th and 21st Party Congresses on the possibility of preventing a new world war under present-day conditions;...these tendencies cannot be qualified in any other way but as a mistaken dogma and left-sectarianism...."

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Not all articles, however, deal directly with revisionism per se. Some, like the article "Elaboration of the History of the October Revolution Following the 20th Congress of the CPSU" by V. G. Ruslyakova (Voprosy Istorii, No 5, May 1960), present a critical examination of works on socioeconomic premises of the proletarian revolution in Russia and praise such writers as Volobuyev, Sidorov, and Mantsev for refuting the revisionist conception of "absolute backwardness of Russia." Ruslyakova's article severely criticizes V. P. Nasyrin for his article showing the "revisionist conception of 'peaceful maturation' of socialism in the womb of capitalism," which was published in Voprosy Istorii, No 5, May 1956.

In an article "On Laws Governing the Cultural Revolution," also appearing in Voprosy Istorii, No 5, May 1960, M. P. Kim vigorously assails the revisionist theory of "cultural maturity" which rejects the influence of "bourgeois" cultural attainments.

Articles "exposing" or attacking revisionism appear not only in official party organs; many are published in cultural and literary periodicals and newspapers. Among these is the review of the book, Problemy Realizma (The Problems of Realism) by V. Dneprov, Leningrad, 1960, which appears in Literatura i Zhizn', 1 June 1960. The reviewer points out that the author argues effectively with revisionist writers in Poland and Yugoslavia against bourgeois aesthetics and modernism.

Literatura i Zhizn' of 15 June 1960 contains an article by Al. Dymshits which discusses various books that have appeared in 1959-1960 dealing with ideological problems. The author reports that the book Protiv Burzhuaiznykh Kontseptsii i Revizionizma v Zarubezhom Literaturovedenii (Against Bourgeois Conceptions and Revisionism in Foreign Literature), a collective work from the Institute of World Literature imeni Gor'kiy, edited by A. Dement'yev, A. Puzikov, and Ya. El'sberg, concerns the struggle against "modern bourgeois ideology and modern revisionism." The article by I. Anisimov, "Against Reactionary Theories of Contemporary Literature," criticizes the existentialists and "unmasks the revisionist ideas" of D. Lukach and A. Le Fevre, and shows the "spiritual flimsiness of the formalistic and aristocratic art theories" of Ortega y Gasset and others. Yu. Borev's article on Le Fevre draws a "portrait" of one of the active revisionists and discloses the anti-Marxist essence of his writings. Ya. El'sberg's article analyzes the aesthetic platform of existentialism and describes some of the works of Lukach, "the patriarch of modern revisionism in literature," whose works are intended as a re-examination of Marxism-Leninism. The book Tvorcheskiy Marksizm i Pustotsvety Revizionizma

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

(Cretative Marxism and the Sterility of Revisionism), by Z. Gershkovich, sharply criticizes the works of Polish, Hungarian, and Yugoslav revisionists; it deals with works by D'yerdya Lukach, Leshek Kolakovsikiy, Henri Le Fevre, and Risto Toshovich, which "serve as masked propaganda of bourgeois individualism and decadence," Dymshits says.

In the new books by Soviet critics and those who are carrying on the struggle against "bourgeois aesthetics and the aesthetic deceptions of revisionism," Dymshits sees not only an unmasking of the enemy, but also an attack on him. He says that in the book O Besspornom i Spornom (On That Which Can Be Argued and That Which Cannot), by Ya. El'sberg, the struggle against existentialism and revisionism is clearly and firmly presented. The book Obraz Kommunisty v Sovetskoy Literature (The Image of a Communist and Soviet Literature), by V. Ozerov, attacks the propagandists of "heroless" literature and revisionists such as Iosip Vidmar, Andzhey Braun, and others who accuse the Russians of "antihumanism" and who in practice "attempt to lead art along the road of petit-bourgeois individualism," according to Dymshits. The book Razgovor Po Povodu... (Conversation of the Occasion), by A. Makarov, presents "a logical attack against bourgeois ideology and an unmasking of treacherous revisionism." And in the book Glavnyy Geroy (The Main Hero), V. Pankov depicts the people in postwar Soviet literature. The reviewer maintains that the book is politically sharp and directed against everything that "hinders the development of Soviet art and socialist realism." The author, Dymshits says, wages war against foreign revisionism and against "the penetration of bourgeois influences in the Soviet literary environment."

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Part 2. FAR EAST

I. CHINA

Revisionism Among Intellectuals

Two controversies among the intellectuals in Communist China have been taking place since approximately the beginning of 1960. One controversy, associated primarily with the name Pa Jen (Wang Jen-shu), has involved the rejection of political direction and goals for literature, and the other, carried on in terms of a debate on the unity of thought and existence, has involved acceptance of the universal applicability of the law of the unity of opposites and the contradiction thesis.

Enduring Universals Over Politics

Discussions of Pa Jen and his espousal of a humanitarianism and human nature which would replace the political content of proletarian literature have multiplied since the republication, along with suitable articles of criticism, of his article "On Human Sentiments" (originally written during the bloom-and-contend period) in the 26 January 1960 issue of Wen-i Pao. As subsequent issues of Wen-i Pao and other periodicals, including Hsin Chien-she, Chung-kuo Ch'ing-nien, and some of the organs of provincial party committees, took up Pa Jen's case, criticisms of the "revisionism" represented by Pa Jen broadened out to include all intellectuals who still harbored remnants of "Bourgeois viewpoints" which caused them to preach standards transcending politics.

The composite case of the revisionists in this controversy is that political direction and aims for proletarian literature have resulted in the loss of all qualities which could give this literature greatness. The substitutes that the revisionists offer -- beauty, reality, humanitarianism, human nature -- have in common the characteristic that standards for literature should transcend politics.

Issue No 8 of Wen-i Pao, 26 April 1960 (page 21), carried an abstract of the proceedings of the Membership Meeting of the Shanghai Branch Association of the China Writers Association, which dealt in part with revisionism in literary circles. The periodical said:

"The conference criticized Chiang K'ung-yang, Ch'ien Ku-yung, Jen Chun, and similar people for their revisionist viewpoints. These people disparage the accomplishments of socialist letters, believing that it has not, and moreover cannot, produce model personalities.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

These revisionists oppose the serving of proletarian politics by letters. They insist that beauty must be above reality, class, and politics and that if there is only 'practicality' to serve the needs of the revolution, we cannot speak of beauty. They propagate bourgeois humanitarianism on a large scale and wipe out the basic difference between proletarian and bourgeois humanitarianism. They want socialist letters to manifest bourgeois humanitarian ideology. They deny the decisive function of the writers' world viewpoint on his methods of writing and believe that the methods of writing of realism and romanticism can transcend periods and class, and develop independently. They also make extreme efforts to exaggerate the accomplishments and advanced function of the bourgeois letters of 19th Century Europe. They oppose criticism and re-evaluation of these 19th Century writers using the viewpoint of historical materialism. The conference engaged in deep discussions and criticisms of these wrong viewpoints and many comrades pointed out that the core of these theories amounts to the liquidation of the class nature of letters and the rubbing out of the boundaries between proletarian and bourgeois letters."

The lead article of the same issue of Wen-i Pao (page 4) was an attack by Ch'ien Chun-jui, deputy director of the Staff Office for Culture and Education, on the humanitarians, pacifists, advocates of the "writing of reality," and advocates of "creative freedom" in literary circles. In his general attack, Ch'ien stated:

"Revisionism is an objective thing which exists as the reflection of bourgeois antisocialist ideology within the working class and the party. In a socialist state, before the influence of the political ideology of the bourgeoisie is thoroughly eliminated, bourgeois antisocialist ideology generally objectively exists. Moreover, such ideology frequently poses as fragrant flowers of socialism. The revisionism in literature is of this type. It is a wolf in sheep's clothing, using the name of Marxism-Leninism to practice opportunism and capitalism. Revisionism in literature is the manifestation of political revisionism in the sphere of letters and arts. The modern revisionism represented by the Yugoslav ruling clique (not excluding the Chinese revisionists) has as its real aim the liquidation of the class struggle and of the socialist revolution, the weakening and elimination of the proletarian dictatorship and of the leadership of the Communist Party.... The modern revisionists, to attain the goals which they cannot tell to other people, in the sphere of literature, trumpet bourgeois humanitarianism, human nature, and pacifism to oppose the revolutionary will of the masses. At the same time, they use bourgeois realism to oppose the revolutionary

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

realism of the proletariat. They propose the 'writing of reality,' which has the twisting of socialist realism as its goal. They deny the decisive function of the revolutionary world viewpoint on the creations of literature. They proclaim the empty 'creative freedom' of the bourgeoisie and oppose the leadership of literature by the party and the state."

Ch'ien then attacked the revisionists in literature by groups. The Yugoslavs, he said, are preaching class harmony to be achieved through humanitarian relationships and feelings. He charged that Hu Feng, Feng Hsueh-feng, and Pa Jen have all been guilty of this offense. Pa Jen he said, had attacked the party and socialism in 1956-1957; he had attacked socialist letters as lacking in "human sentiments" and "humanitarianism of a basic human nature" and had clamored that humanitarianism should be the "foundation" of literature. Even now, Ch'ien said, Pa Jen has not carried out conscientious self-criticism and reform.

It is of interest to note that the April 1960 issue of Hsin Chien-she (page 17) had carried an article by one of Pa Jen's critics, Li Hsi-fan, which stated that "this corrupt theory of human nature can still form a kind of opposition current to confront socialist letters"; and that the 1 July 1960 issue of Chung-kuo Ch'ing-nien (page 17) carried an article by Meng I which said: "The theory of human nature and humanitarianism in the ideological system of bourgeois literary studies can today still deceive some of the youth and constitute a weapon of the revisionists at home and abroad for attacking Marxism-Leninism. It is especially necessary today for us to thoroughly liquidate them. In today's society, to trumpet abstract and transclass human nature and humanitarianism, to deny party and class, to compromise or obliterate the class struggles -- these are to plot for the maintenance of the interests and ruling position of the bourgeoisie, and absolutely cannot be tolerated."

Ch'ien Chung-jui's attack on Pa Jen is only one of many published by Chinese Communist periodicals. One of the most informative was the article "What Kind of Good Is Pa Jen's 'Reaching Principles Through Feelings,'" by Liu Ning, published in Hsin Chien-she, No 6, 7 June 1960. In answer to the question of how Pa Jen is revising the theory of the class struggle, Liu said:

"Superficially, he [Pa Jen] does not deny the class struggle. On the contrary, he asserts that the class theorists in literature do not understand where the 'pivot' of the class struggle advocated by the proletariat resides. He attacks 'dogma' and 'lack of human sentiments' in today's literature, believing that these defects are due to a 'mechanical understanding of the principle of the theory of class in literature.' However, this is simply the cunning that constitutes a habit of revisionism. Chairman Mao has taught us that 'revisionists and rightist opportunists wear the sign of Marxism and also attack dogmatism, but that what they attack are the most fundamental things of Marxism.'

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

"Pa Jen is exactly like this. He pretends to acknowledge the class struggle, but actually twists and denies the most basic things of the theory of class struggle of Marxism from the three basic aspects of reasons, aims, and procedures." (page 55-56)

In reasons for class struggle, Liu said, Pa Jen believes that there are "...requirements, loves, and hopes which can be said to arise from basic human nature. Class society suppresses the basic human nature of mankind and therefore there is class struggle." Liu paraphrases Pa Jen as saying that class struggle arises because human nature is repressed or because the wants, loves, and hopes of people are obstructed. "To his [Pa Jen's] way of speaking, between enemy classes there exists no basic confrontation of class interests. On the contrary, there exists the so-called 'basic nature of mankind' which pervades everyone, and class struggle has its cause in the suppression of this 'basic nature of mankind.' We must therefore necessarily arrive at the following conclusion: Class contradictions and struggles are not incapable of compromise. It is necessary only to bring out a little more of the 'basic nature of mankind' in the enemy classes, necessary only to further 'seek similarities' and not to obstruct the existence and development of the enemy class, and it will be possible to eliminate class struggle." (page 56)

A second type of revisionist in literature attacked by Ch'ien Chun-ju in his article in the 26 April 1960 issue of Wen-i Pao were the advocates of the "writing of reality," who, he said, include the Hungarian revisionist Lukcas, Hu Feng, Feng Hsieh-feng, and now, Li Ho-lin. He accused them of believing that there is no need to study revolutionary theory or to be familiar with the social livelihood of the masses or to go among them, and of denying the relations between politics and literature and the decisive function of world viewpoints for writing. Lukcas is said to have stated that world viewpoints are "intrusions" which hinder the writer from being impartial and faithful in recording reality. Ch'ien said that in its present form, as expressed by Li Ho-lin, this revisionist trend asserts that the "ideology" in a work depends on whether the work reflects life, and that the success of this reflection is the equivalent of the level of the art incorporated in the work; hence the formula, ideology is reality is art, or, art is politics.

The attacks on the humanitarians and writers of reality have introduced, as a subsidiary issue, the problem of the standards by which literature is to be judged, an issue which has been taken up as a subject in its own right in the periodicals.

The 1 June 1960 issue of Wen-i Pao (page 10) carried an article entitled "On the Power for Life of Classic Works and the So-Called 'Universal Human Nature.'" The article stated the line of the revisionists by quoting Pa Jen as saying, "The content which, in a product of art,

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

in all ages, can stimulate the people of different social classes, is the characteristics common to all mankind." In contrast, the author cited Mao as denying the existence of something abstract and universal which can be reflected in literature, and saying that human feelings and humanitarianism must be expressed through the concrete. Love, the most prevalent of the "universals" common to all mankind mentioned by the revisionists, said the author, has its significance in classic works of literature not in its own right, but because profound social relationships are revealed through such "universals." Similarly, the 11 June 1960 issue of Wen-i Pao (page 14) stated: "Wherever they [the revisionists] find manifestations of human nature, in classic works, we find manifestations of class nature."

The theme of standards for literary criticism was also discussed by the 1 July 1960 issue of Chung-kuo Ch'ing-nien (page 17). An article entitled "Use the Method of Historicism to Critically Inherit Literature" criticized adulation of the 19th Century European "realists" on the grounds that although these writers did expose and criticize the realities of their day, they were unable to escape their class limitations and so operated from the positions of individualism, democracy, and reformism. The article advocated that the works of these writers, as the works of all writers of the past, be critically accepted on the basis of assigning superior and classic status to those works which "can help us to understand the society of that time and to increase our knowledge of the class struggle."

A third group of revisionists in literature criticized by Ch'ien Chun-jui in his article in the 26 April 1960 issue of Wen-i Pao are the pacifists. Ch'ien identified no members of this group except for crediting Lukcas with having laid the theoretical foundations for this stand. The pacifists, he said, do not distinguish between just and unjust wars. He accused them of spreading fear of injury, pessimism, and fear psychology among the people, of not seeking the cause of war "in the nature of imperialism," and of not admitting to "the justice of righteous wars." They picture the horrors of battlefields to "sap the will of the people, the proletariat, and the oppressed classes," he said, and they oppose all wars as against human nature and humanity.

A fourth group of revisionists in literature criticized by Ch'ien Chun-jui are the advocates of "creative freedom." This group, which rejects the leadership or supervision of the party over literature and refuses to serve politics, includes Wu Tsu-kuang and Ch'in Yao-yang. Pa Jen is also considered a member of the group, since he "hates the leadership of the party" and wants a policy of broad tolerance for the arts.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Contradictions and Law of Unity of Opposition

The second controversy, although couched innocuously in terms of an esoteric debate over whether there is any unity between thought and existence, and if so, which has primacy, has probably been of more significance for the immediate political scene because of its direct bearing on Mao's contradiction thesis, as well as on the intellectuals' acceptance of the philosophical foundations of Marxism. The importance which the Chinese Communists themselves attach to this controversy is indicated by the fact that criticisms of the revisionists in this field have not only been voluminous in the intellectual periodicals since November 1959, but have also appeared twice in Hung-ch'i, with articles by Wang Jo-shui, the chief critic of the revisionists, in the 1 April and 1 June 1960 issues.

In the 1 June issue, Wang presented the significance of the controversy by saying that the question "...is a problem that is not only of abstract theory, but one of very great practical significance. The materialist dialectical method is the Marxist view of the universe and the law of the unity of opposites is the most basic law of the materialist dialectical method. The firm thorough materialist must recognize the universal existence of this law, that it is in application everywhere, that it is ever-lasting, that there are no exceptions to it.... In contrast to the dialectical method, metaphysics [the revisionists] has as its most basic viewpoint the denial of the law of the unity of opposites, believing that where there is unity, there are no contradictions, and where there are contradictions, there is no unity, and that opposites cannot be studied into unity or unity into opposites.... It can be seen then that the recognition or nonrecognition of the law of the unity of opposites is a pivotal problem for distinguishing between the dislectical method and metaphysics." (page 16)

The primary revisionist in this controversy, Shih Ch'eng, was quoted by Wang as having written: "A unity of a nature of contradictions between thought and existence cannot be acknowledged because the two do not exist together in common in one entity under certain conditions and do not rely on each other or change in common under certain conditions...." (page 16)

According to Wang, Shih Ch'eng, in subsequent writings, was forced to speak of the application of the dialectical method to the relations between thought and existence, but he then claimed that the unity between thought and existence and the unity of the dialectical method are completely different and that "we cannot confuse the two." This Wang said, amounted to a denial of unity between thought and existence.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

A second revisionist in this controversy identified by Wang Jo-shui is Li Wei-i, whom Wang accused of using a different formula to arrive at Shih Ch'eng's conclusions; Li said, "We must not, because of the most general law of the unity of opposites for all things, therefore call the particular and different opposites that we are studying, that is, the relations between thought and existence, 'Unity.'" (page 17)

A third revisionist is Hua Hsu-yu, whom Wang Jo-shui accused of even more directness when stating the revisionist position thus: "We absolutely should not take abstract thought and force a dialectical unity with it onto actual existence." (page 17)

Wang wrote: "The comrades who oppose the unity of thought and existence use the following logic: 'Thought and existence in the final analysis are different, are not the same' (Shih Ch'eng). 'Thought and existence are not the same thing, attribute or phenomenon. We cannot lump the two together and call them the same' (Li Wei-i)."

Wang's own position was that "existence is primary, thought secondary,...thought and existence constitute a unity of opposites." (page 17) He further stated: "We believe that the thorough materialist must acknowledge the unity of thought and existence, and that it is only by firmly recognizing the dialectical unity of thought and existence that we can unwaveringly maintain the materialist principle that 'existence is first and thought second.'" (page 18)

The relevance of the controversy to Mao's contradiction thesis is that the revisionist stand can logically be used as grounds for rejecting the existence of internal contradictions and the role of contradictions as the motive power for the development of society. The lead article, "Contradictions Are the Motive Power for the Development of Society," by Wu Chih-pu, in the 7 June 1960 issue of Hsin Chien-she (page 1), presents a description of such rejectors which makes them almost indistinguishable from the revisionists in the controversy over thought and existence. Wu said:

"Some people do not believe that in a socialist society, in addition to contradictions between us and the enemy, there are internal contradictions of the people. They even go so far as to believe that in the so-called atomic age, we can eliminate the boundaries between us and the enemy, that cats and rats can sleep together, even that there are no contradictions between us and the enemy. Some people do not believe that in a socialist society, there is a mutually contradictory aspect as well as a mutually suited aspect to the relations between the productive relationships and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base; that in addition to the

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

mutually suited aspect, there is a mutually contradictory aspect. They even go so far as to believe that in a socialist system, there are no contradictions which are not mutually suited and that it is not necessary to seek development from solving contradictions and from battle; that is, that in advancing toward Communism, we do not need to have excessive flying leaps or changes of a revolutionary nature.

"On the problem of the motive power for the development of socialist society, some people believe that it is necessary only to have technology develop, to have the forces of production develop, and to have the level of the rate of production attain a certain degree; and that it is not necessary to have any innovations of the social system, not necessary to rely on the broad masses in carrying out the struggles along the economic, political, and ideological fronts, to enter into Communist society. That is, we do not need to solve the contradictions of the social system and between man and man for it to be possible for society to develop. Contradictions are no longer the motive power that pushes the wheel of society in continuous advance. They believe that it is only the solidarity and unity of the socialist society, its firmness like granite, that is the motive power for development. This way of speaking violates the objective laws of social development and the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on uninterrupted revolution and dialectical materialism. This wrong way of speaking can cause the broad masses of socialist society to lose their direction and the socialist system to stop and not advance. Therefore, the solving of the problem of what is the motive power for the development of socialist society is extremely important."

In contrast to the stand of the revisionists, Wu Chih-pu quoted from Mao's contradiction thesis: "The philosophy of Marxism recognizes that the law of the unity of opposites is the basic law of the universe. This law, no matter in the natural world, in society, or in the thoughts of men, exists universally.... Contradictions exist universally."

II. INDONESIA

Party Reaction to Soviet-Chinese Controversy

A survey of Harian Rakjat from 29 June 1960 to 15 July 1960, when the Djakarta war administration banned the paper for an indefinite period, indicates that the PKI (Indonesian Communist Party) may have at least partially resolved the conflict between the "hard" or "pro-Chinese" line propounded by several party leaders in late May and early June 1960 and the moderate views generally associated with Chairman of the Central

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Committee Aidit, which are more in harmony with the Soviet position. The evidence is rather scanty, however; by the end of June 1960, the PKI, like its Chinese comrades, appeared reluctant to publish material dealing with contested ideological issues. The only article observed during the period under review which deals directly with the PKI's attitude toward the ideological dispute between Peiping and Moscow is an editorial entitled "War and Peace," in the 30 June 1960 Harian Rakjat. Its purpose is to announce that the PKI has rallied to the compromise line proclaimed in the Bucharest Communique.

This editorial begins by accusing the "imperialists" of wanting "war only, not peace." The desire of the peoples of the world for "peace only," it says, was clearly expressed in the recent Bucharest Communique, which is portrayed as a reaffirmation of the 1957 Moscow Declaration and the Peace Manifesto. The editorial highlights the 1957 Declaration as follows: "It stated that 'at present the forces of peace have developed to such an extent that there is a clear possibility for preventing war,' but it also warned that 'while imperialism exists, there will be grounds for aggressive war'...and it made clear that 'all nations must show the greatest possible vigilance toward the danger of war which is caused by imperialism.'" The editorial notes that the PKI expressed full support for the 1957 Declaration at its sixth national congress. It also asserts that subsequent events further proved the validity of the theses expressed in both the Declaration and the Bucharest Communique, citing the PRRI (Revolutionary Republic of Indonesia), Pope, and Karel Doorman affairs, as well as "imperialist obstinacy and defeats in South Korea, Turkey, and Japan" as evidence of this. The editorial concludes with the following formal injunction: "If we wish to solve the problem of war and peace correctly, we must study and practice the principles in the Declaration, the Peace Manifesto, and the Communique."

On 8 July 1960, Harian Rakjat published the PKI's statement, which was a detailed and highly critical analysis of the failures of the present Indonesian cabinet during its first year of existence. On 15 July Harian Rakjat carried a similar statement emanating from the national council of Sobsi (All-Indonesia Federation of Labor Unions), and during July, according to the press, that organization and its subsidiary unions were engaged in a vigorous campaign against the Minister of Labor. The discussions in the press do not indicate whether or not the party's decision to apply increased pressure to the government in these ways and thereby attempt to force Communist participation in the cabinet was motivated by recent Chinese arguments for a more vigorous pursuit of the revolutionary struggle in countries such as Indonesia. The theoretical implications of the PKI statement seem to indicate a continued pursuit of the middle road customarily followed by the party in the past. For example, it contains a direct appeal to the national bourgeoisie to ally itself with the PKI

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

against "the new bureaucratic bourgeoisie, which is trying to suppress both economic and political freedom." It sharply criticizes Indonesia's approval of the Yugoslav proposal for a little summit meeting of neutralist nations this attack was developed at length in a 12 July 1960 Harian Rakjat article by the PKI central committee foreign department), on the grounds that it would "sabotage the struggle against imperialism." It also viciously assails Foreign Minister Subandrio's policies toward "imperialism" in passage such as the following, but without exceeding the limits imposed at Bucharest:

"The international situation is indeed very favorable for the democratic and peace-loving forces. Never has the American war policy been so isolated and become so rapidly bankrupt as it is today.

"In this present international situation, especially in Asia, and in the present domestic situation, all of which is favorable to the democratic forces, the Indonesian people must not relax and lessen their vigilance in following the foreign policy now being pursued by the Indonesian Foreign Minister....

"The American imperialists will not stand idly by, but will seek opportunities to preserve and continue their aggressive schemes to plunge the world into a new war. National vigilance must be further raised, and activities to smash the counterrevolutionaries, to oppose American imperialism, and to completely liquidate the survivals of colonialism must be intensified."

In contrast to the large number of NCNA dispatches dealing with matters of policy which were carried in Harian Rakjat during most of June, only two articles of this type appeared in the period surveyed. These were excerpts from a Soong Ch'ing-ling article (originally published in the 26 June 1960 Peking Review), which appeared in Harian Rakjat on 29 June, and coverage of a Mao Tse-tung speech to a Japanese cultural delegation in Shanghai, published in Harian Rakjat on 6 July. Madame Soong's article indicated, if not a modification of the Chinese position on "the nature of imperialism," certainly a tendency to tone down the violence of its expression. Similarly, Mao's statement, although strongly anti-imperialist, was not in any sense a defense of the Chinese line in Marxist-Leninist terms.

With the decline in the number of Chinese statements published in Harian Rakjat during this period, the paper's coverage of the Soviet position increased sharply. On 29 June 1960, there was a brief article noting the signing of the Bucharest Communiqué, the full text of which appeared on 30 June. The 29 June Harian Rakjat also carried a fairly long Tass dispatch on Khrushchev's speech to the public meeting which

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

concluded the Rumanian party congress. This was the first time, in the paper's reporting of the recent ideological dispute, that remarks by Khrushchev on Marxist-Leninist theory were observed. From 4 to 11 July, Harian Rakjat published four long articles, all Tass dispatches, detailing Khrushchev's remarks during his Austrian tour. On 11 July, it featured Khrushchev's speech at the reception honoring First Minister Djuanda's visit to Moscow. These articles contained no discussion of the issue at the ideological level. On 15 July it published extensive excerpts from the general declaration issued by the Bureau of the World Peace Council at the close of its 9-11 July session in Stockholm.

The following pattern emerges from a survey of Harian Rakjat for the period 1 May-15 July. The PKI did its best to ignore the Soviet-Chinese ideological controversy during May, until on 30 May, with the publication of an article by Sudisman, a member of the politburo, it initiated a vigorous presentation of the "Chinese line," which was also defended in articles by Tjoo Tik-tjoen and Ngadiman Hardjosubroto and in Achadijat's speech to the WFTU session in Peiping. This speech was published in Harian Rakjat on 10 June 1960 and was the last Indonesian exposition of the "hard" line observed in the press. During the ensuing week, Harian Rakjat published NCNA dispatches reporting on statements by Chinese leaders; the last of these to be noted appeared on 16 June. During this period, the only presentations of the moderate line which bore on the issues in the Sino-Soviet controversy were a brief remark by Aidit in his speech on the anniversary of the Bandung conference; a two-part article by Politburo Member Sakirman, which appeared in Harian Rakjat on 9 and 10 June; and perhaps Aidit's speech on the 40th anniversary of the PKI; coverage of the Soviet line in Tass dispatches was almost entirely lacking. As of mid-June, Harian Rakjat's reporting was weighted in favor of the Chinese.

The PKI then appeared again to enter a period of indecision during which its organ generally ignored ideological questions. The paper failed to print any passages dealing with Marxism-Leninism in its report on Khrushchev's speech to the Rumanian Party Congress. However, following the congress and the resulting Bucharest Communique, the paper published the editorial "War and Peace" on 30 June and there was a sharp upswing in Tass dispatches detailing Khrushchev's remarks during the first 2 weeks in July. Nonetheless, Harian Rakjat's failure to reprint any of the detailed Soviet responses to the Chinese line, as well as the lack of any rebuttal by Indonesian party leaders themselves to their four comrades who had so clearly taken a Chinese view of the situation, would seem to indicate that these were little more than gestures and that the PKI remains strongly attracted to the Peiping line.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

III. NORTH VIETNAM

Press Maintains Neutral Position on Sino-Soviet Differences

The position of the regime in North Vietnam on Sino-Soviet differences on peaceful coexistence seems again to be one of neutrality. During the period 23 June-15 July 1960, little partiality toward either Peiping or Moscow is evidenced in the press or in the statements of party leaders. They seem almost to be closing their eyes to the existence of such a controversy.

Four of the articles around which the dispute revolves appeared in the press during the period of this survey; however, where the full text was not printed, the North Vietnam press omitted the controversial parts and avoided use of the words "revisionism" and "revisionist."

The articles covered were: the full text of Khrushchev's speech at the Rumanian party congress; the full text of the communique issued by the parties attending that congress (this was printed in Nhan Dan on 28 June and reprinted in the same paper on 9 July); a full translation of the editorial from Jen-min Jih-pao on the Rumanian communique and the 1957 Moscow declaration on revisionism; and excerpts from the speech made by Peng Chen, Politburo member of the Chinese Communist Party, at this congress.

It could be of some significance that Nhan Dan devoted large sections of three issues, 23, 25, and 26 June, to the full text of Khrushchev's speech while only three half columns on 24 June were given to excerpts from Peng Chen's speech. Also, the parts omitted from the Vietnamese account of the latter were Peng's references to "modern revisionism" and to the great exploits and achievements of the Chinese people.

The North Vietnamese stand of neutrality is well expressed in an editorial in the 28 June issue of Nhan Dan, which said: "The Vietnamese Communists all fully agree with the matters dealt with in the joint communique of the Bucharest meeting. We Vietnamese Communists realize that the strengthening of unity and unanimity among all Communist and Workers Parties in the socialist bloc and throughout the world is the primary task of all Marxist-Leninists in all countries.... We are elated at the unceasing consolidation of unity and agreement among our fraternal parties, and we are striving to contribute positively to the strengthening of this sacred unity and agreement."

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

This idea of unity and desire for peace was again stated in the DRV (Democratic Republic of Vietnam) government note to the Soviet government upholding the latter's stand on disarmament. This note, published in the 11 July issue of Nhan Dan, declared: "The DRV government fully approves the Soviet decision to suspend its participation in the conference of the ten-nation committee and to submit the disarmament question to the coming regular session of the UN General Assembly. The DRV government emphatically condemns the dishonesty of the US and other Western nations, approves the Soviet government's willingness to continue the disarmament talks, and believes that if future talks are to have good results, the participation of a number of countries in addition to those already represented is necessary. The DRV government believes that the attendance of the People's Republic of China is most essential."

The stand of the North Vietnam regime was definitely set forth by Premier and Politburo member Pham Van Dong in his report to the first session of the Second National Assembly. A large part of this report, which appeared in Nhan Dan on 8 July, was devoted to denunciation of the US and praise for the USSR for its "constant efforts toward world peace." In his closing statement, Pham Van Dong said: "The people and government of the DRV have made constant efforts to strengthen unity and agreement with all countries in the socialist bloc, headed by the mighty Soviet Union, and at the same time to increase friendly relations with other countries of the world according to the five principles of peaceful coexistence in order to contribute to the maintenance and consolidation of world peace."

Beyond this, he voiced support of the Soviet proposal that participation in a summit conference should include such large Asian powers as China, India, and Indonesia, when he said: "The Vietnamese people would warmly appreciate the presence of the People's Republic of China at the summit conference. In truth, it is unreasonable to ignore the 650 million Chinese people while trying to settle major problems of the world today. That is why, despite all attempts by the US imperialists, who are reactionary and blind, to hide the sun with their hands, reason will triumph in international relations and the great People's Republic of China will occupy its well deserved position in the present international arena."

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Part 3. EASTERN EUROPE

Revisionist currents in Eastern Europe were reflected in discussions on art and literature, science and technology, and international problems.

In art and literature, there were indications that Hungarian literary journals had not abandoned their earlier favorable treatment of modernist tendencies. This was evident in, among other things, a survey of literary tastes of Hungarians, comment on the recent "science-literature" debate in Literaturnaya Gazeta, and a plea not to dictate to young writers. The East German theoretical journal characterized the author of an art history as being "very close to revisionist art theories" and admitted that the revisionist influence of Gyorgy Lukacs was still prevalent among the country's literary intelligentsia.

Discussions on science and technology featured a Hungarian counter-attack on the modernist line, in which the belief that natural science could fill the role of social factors was refuted. A similar line was followed in another antirevisionist attack, scoring "bourgeois and revisionist theories which make a fetish of technology." The East German theoretical journal gave voice to regime concern that the country's natural scientists were harboring positivist views on science, denying in particular the applicability of dialectical materialism to modern physics.

Internationally, the Hungarian theoretical journal, in approving the Soviet peaceful coexistence line and pointing to the ever-worsening condition of imperialism, attacked such revisionist heresies as the concept of a "unified world process" leading to world socialism. Segments of the East German scientific and artistic intelligentsia were denounced for "third-way" views on the solution of the German reunification problem. Yugoslavia answered a recent Soviet "quasi-ideological" attack on revisionism in the Yugoslav economy and foreign policy.

I. EAST GERMANY

Reaction to West German SPD Theories; Revisionist Tendencies in Art, Literature, Natural Science

East German publications for some time have been vigorously combating various manifestations of the West German SPD (Social Democratic Party) "theory of the third way." In addition, numerous dissident views on the popular level, in reaction to the collapse of the summit conference and deteriorating economic situation in East Germany, have recently been reflected in the press.

Excerpts from two articles on the question of German reunification which indicate this popular reaction follow.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

"...Among a part of the privately practicing medical and free-lance artistic intelligentsia and those at scientific institutes,...illusions and a false evaluation of the character of the West German state have become widespread. These persons represent the viewpoint that both sides [East and West] in Germany must give in somewhat. Other members of the intelligentsia do not understand the connection between the rate of socialist development in our republic and our fight for a peaceful, democratic reunification of Germany...." -- Report of the Bezirk Karl-Marx-Stadt SED (Socialist Unity Party of Germany) management (Freie Presse, 25 June 1960)

"...Among cooperative farmers who are not party members in the Bezirk [Gera], the opinion is expressed in discussions that the question of Germany can be solved by taking a more or less middle line, that the question cannot be solved without both sides giving in. Behind this view is hidden (although it is not openly stated) the view expressed by the question, 'Who knows how things will eventually turn out?' [i.e., perhaps Communism will not win out]. The harmfulness of this view lies in the fact that it not only confuses people, but it also affects their work and the results of such work. It is clear that those who approach the question of Germany in this way will not exert much effort to fulfill the plan.... Of course things will turn out differently, not for the GDR, but rather for West Germany...." -- Albert Norden at the Bezirk Gera SED delegates conference (Volkswacht, 21 June 1960)

In addition, there has been evidence of what could be termed revisionist tendencies in the fields of art and literature. The following excerpts from the June 1960 issue of the East German theoretical journal, Einheit, denounce a recent book on art history.

"Wolfgang Huett, in his book on art history, Wir und die Kunst (Art and Ourselves), published in 1959, succeeds in imparting much worthwhile information...in an easily understandable fashion. No one disputes the fact that an investigation of problems of artistic form, such as surface and line,...color, and composition, is certainly necessary and is frequently very neglected in our art scholarship and criticism. But Huett does not take adequate account of the function...of art in society, the side of reality on which it should concentrate. His treatment of formal problems [alone]...results in the fact that the content of a work of art is excluded in his characterization. This fact encourages those theories of bourgeois decadence which are concerned only with artistic form but which eliminate the [concept of] content....

"As a result of this improper approach, Huett, in the first part of his book, arrives at all kinds of unsatisfactory absolute statements, but particularly the declaration that viewers should approach a work of art with an 'unprejudiced and open mind as much as possible.'" Such an attitude is, however, not at all possible..., because a work of art is always

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

created under a very definite sociohistorical ideal by an artist with a very definite relationship to the world and because the viewer also approaches art...from the vantage point of his own philosophy and experience in life.... No one approaches art with an open mind, because...certain aesthetic information on one's surroundings is expected from a work of art. Huett's assertion bears neo-Kantian traits. It could result in an 'open-minded' attitude toward major works of decadent art, which, however, would mean approaching them uncritically, and in the end, justifying these works....

"The author does not attain...a convincing clarification of the concepts on content and form in art.... Marxist art scholarship will not be able to progress one step forward if these general concepts are not clearly defined. Huett essentially interprets [simply] those concepts which have already penetrated old bourgeois-academic scholarship; but the development of art changes and new concepts arise.... Thus, socialist painting...has long ago enlarged the concept of genre painting with sociopolitical themes... which are no longer included in the old concept of genre painting....

"However, Huett has accomplished a great deal in presenting the first portrayal [in East Germany]...of early oriental, Egyptian, and classical art on the basis of historical materialism....

"In his book, Huett conceives of art as simply a reflection of reality, as a mere reflection of ideas and thoughts by a class. But this alone does not cancel the old bourgeois...idea of the 'independence' of art history. A view which more or less ignores the essence of art as a particular means of knowing and ignores the very active function of art...cannot completely detach itself from the methods of bourgeois art history...and overcome these methods. In fact, one finds in Huett's book...reminiscences of art history and history in and of itself [without reference to political, economic, etc. forces], as well as other echoes of bourgeois methods.... This book...does not adequately take into consideration the importance of the masses' fight for artistic progress and it describes the development of new art too simply....

"Above all, Huett does not satisfactorily analyze the role of the...proletariat in the development of national art. In a general characterization of 19th Century art, he does not mention the working class even once. In particular, the author does not take into account Lenin's teaching on the existence of two cultures in every bourgeois national culture:... Huett simply says proletarian art 'grows out' of bourgeois art. This assertion, along with his demand for an 'unprejudiced' acceptance of works of art, brings the author very close to revisionist art theories. Huett also cannot clearly explain the essence...of socialist realism,...which has developed by historical necessity in all countries in which the working class has fought for its...liberation. It is based on common social-artistic strivings, but is expressed in national folk form. It arose, in literature as in art and in Russia as in Germany and other countries, before, and not after the socialist revolution.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Huett does not clearly...show that the principles of socialist realism were necessarily and lawfully applied even during the antifascist democratic stage of GDR development. He does not analyze West German art since the war and passes over the great national significance of progressive art in the GDR....

"Thus, Huett's book leaves a divided impression.... While it imparts much new information, it is oriented inadequately or even falsely toward basic questions. The new edition must be basically revised. The defects of the work arise, however, not alone from the inadequacy of the author; they are characteristic, to a large extent, of the situation in our art scholarship, particularly in theoretical research...."

The party press (most recently the January 1960 issue of Einheit) has strongly indicated that of the revisionist influences of the 1956-1957 period, those of Gyorgy Lukacs among the East German literary intelligentsia have been sustained more effectively than most others. A long-range plan for bringing writers, as well as all other artists, into conformity with party aims was set forth at the April 1958 Bitterfeld Conference, and the effects of this conference are now becoming more evident in the current movement of artists into factories, cooperative farms, mines, etc. However, there has been no indication that this movement has had an effect on literary theory at the university level. In fact, the continued existence of revisionist thinking was strongly implied when an Informationsbuero West item of 9 June 1960 reported that a conference "to strengthen the basis of Marxism Leninism in literary scholarship in the GDR" was scheduled for 24 and 25 June 1960 in Leipzig. The conference, which was to be prepared by the literature institute of the Karl-Marx University in Leipzig, was to "dispute all reactionary and unscientific theories and methodologies, including revisionism"; the agenda was to be based on the teachings of Lenin. The only East German published report on this conference noted thus far appeared in Leipziger Volkszeitung of 3 July 1960. It said:

"The main speaker at the conference,...sponsored by the literature institute of Karl-Marx University...was Dr John, head of the department of aesthetics in the Institute of Philosophy, who spoke on the meaning of Lenin's theory of reflection as applied to literary science. In the discussion...young scholars disputed particularly the false ideas, incitement, and unscientific features of the West German so-called 'East Research' in the field of literature. But unfortunately the problems of Marxist literature propaganda were not as thoroughly discussed."

The following are excerpts from Dr John's speech as reported in the article:

"'It is characteristic for many forms of artistic reflection [based on Lenin's concept] in drama and the epic, in painting and sculpture, that an outer similarity [to the subject] exists to a considerable extent. On

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

this fact are based all the well-known attempts to define art as an imitation of reality. Many bourgeois and revisionist art theoreticians try, by using their inadequate knowledge of Lenin's theory of reflection, to make this fact absolute and to cancel the reflecting nature of such art forms as music...and architecture, as well as lyric poetry, by pointing to the fact that they lack an outer similarity [to reality]. The next thing they do is to completely deny [the theory of] reflection in the field of art.

"The dialectical-materialist thesis that art is a reflection of reality conceives the essence of art in a deeper and more complete way than that definition which often serve the materialists of the past, namely, that art is an imitation of reality....

"In this connection, something should be said on the relationship between truth and honesty. Revisionists try to eliminate the question of truth by asserting that this deals with a "scientific-theoretical" category, and they further try to eliminate the question of artistic partisanship by asserting that this deals with a political motive. In place of both of these, they offer as a kind of substitute, a highly abstract..."artistic honesty."

"One must say that from the standpoint of Lenin's reflection theory, the question of truth, the question of whether we are dealing with a true or distorted reflection of reality, is not only of basic importance for science, but also...for all forms of reflection, including art. Every attempt to operate with an abstract concept of honesty is to be energetically refuted; an example of such attempts is the assertion that the artist, writer, or philosopher is honest who says and writes what he thinks and that such an "honest" person will dispense with the question of the quality of his thoughts and feelings."

A further concern of the regime press, both recently and in the past, has centered on the suspicion that East German natural scientists hold what has been denounced as positivist views on science; particularly beliefs in the inapplicability of dialectical materialism to modern physics, especially to quantum mechanics. Articles in both the April and July 1960 issues of Einheit were devoted to refuting these views as expressed by such Western scientists as Werner Heisenberg and Niels Bohr. (See Review of Communist Theoretical Journals (5)). However, speaking in general terms, the July issue of Einheit said that "many scientists feel themselves drawn to positivism, because they think that it fights more consistently [than any other philosophy] against senseless speculations which make more difficult the progress of science. They particularly turn against the too narrow idea patterns of mechanical materialism, the limits of which are becoming more and more clear."

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

The application of dialectical materialism to natural science was the purpose of a symposium which was held for scientists and Marxist philosophers 8-11 October 1959 in Leipzig. Despite this conference, which sought in general to impose greater doctrinal control over scientists, it appears from discussions in the press that natural scientists have been able to maintain a modicum of independence because of the situation arising from a shortage of scientific personnel in East Germany.

II. HUNGARY

Symptoms of Revisionism Continue

Despite attacks on "modernism" which described it as a mask for every ideological sin from existentialism through narodnikism to Durrenmatt cosmoplite third-roadism (see Communist Revisionism and Dissidence (2)), the Hungarian literary journals have not abandoned their previous favorable treatment of modernist tendencies.

The July 1960 issue of Nagyvilag continued its modernist line and published a public opinion survey which supported it in this endeavor. The top five foreign authors desired by Hungarians, in order of their popularity, were: Durrenmatt, Sartre, Hemingway, Camus, and Sholokhov. In addition, Nagyvilag undertook to explain Dudintsev's "A New Year's Tale": "Dudintsev's story portrays the recovery of consciousness, the awakening to their tasks, of the intellectuals, living barrenly and vegetating amidst their magnificent scientific possibilities; and in the figure of the owl it presents one of the important motifs of this awakening, one of the controlling problems of modern literature and of modern thought: Time."

The "Time" symbol was again used in a poem in the 8 July 1960 Elet es Irodalom; "Do not suffocate in Time," warned Tamas Nador in a poem titled "Love." As with Dudintsev's owl, Time is both a threat and a promise, a sign of possible victory, but a taskmaster which demands that the intellectuals act in the present. This does not at all subtract from the divine nature of Time noted in the "Revisionist Elan" article in Communist Revisionism and Dissidence (1); "Fear God and keep his commandments" was the preacher's final word in a world of vanity.

Comment on the "science-literature" debate in the Moscow Literaturnaya Gazeta appeared in the 15 July 1960 Elet es Irodalom in an article by Pal E. Feher, who noted Marietta Saginyan's proposal that Kozirjev's time theory be exploited for artistic purposes.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Another interesting comment on the Soviet literary scene appeared in an article in the 8 July 1960 Elet es Irodalom, in which the editor of Nagyvilag gave unstinted praise to Tvardovskiy's "Distance Beyond Distance," noting that Tvardovskiy had again offered a helping hand to his people in "a moment of trial" -- the trial being their attempt to go forward from Stalinism.

In its 22 July 1960 issue, the editor of Elet es Irodalom, Miklos Szabolcsi, took up a more direct defense of his own modernist policies and cautioned against dictating to the young writers; "We must not force our youth into an outmoded schema or into rigid rules; we want to see from them that courage and freshness, that bold exposure of truth which is now beginning to develop in Soviet literature and which is now again taking to the road in Western progressive literature."

But the modernist line is not going unchallenged. The rigid party line literary monthly Tiszataj, published in Szeged, devoted considerable space in its May 1960 issue to a refutation of ideas linked with the term "atomic era": "The words 'atomic era'...give rise to a belief that a special branch of natural science can fill the role of social factors." On the contrary, the journal argues, social factors are primary, and a study of science cannot replace a study of dialectical materialism. In the course of this exposition, the Tiszataj authors created for themselves a good bit of confusion as to what constituted superstructure and what constituted base. They promised to publish more on this subject, but they did not do so in June or July. (See Eastern Europe Press Surveys (113-115) for a more complete treatment of the above articles on the literary debate in Hungary.)

July, however, saw a massive attack on revisionist heresies by the party theoretical journal Tarsadalmi Szemle. In an unsigned article titled "Concerning Several Problems of the Struggle Being Waged for Peace and Socialism," which gave total approval to the peaceful coexistence line of the Soviet Union and pointed to the "ever worsening condition of imperialism," it attacked such revisionist heresies as: "the reformist illusion being spread about 'organized capitalism'"; "theories...which say that the capitalist state has become a 'suprasocietal' force, that monopoly capitalism, of itself, in a spontaneous manner, is transforming itself into socialism"; and the revisionist contention that there is "some sort of 'unified world process' which allegedly leads to world socialism." Although these are Yugoslav or Social Democrat heresies, Tarsadalmi Szemle's attack might be considered evidence of some revisionist Hungarian sympathy for them.

This article also takes up, very gingerly, the problem of the effect of technological development on the formation of history. With an eye to both Chinese and revisionist objections the article argues: "Nor can the Marxists, who recognize the ruling role of productive forces in the development of society, underestimate the significance and effect of technology --

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

including the military arts.... Nor can anyone say...that military arts in themselves are the effective factor independent of social classes and systems.... Marxists should reject those bourgeois and revisionist theories which make a fetish of technology and spread the erroneous belief that the development of technology makes superfluous social changes, the socialist revolution. However, in the avoiding of war this is not what is involved...." The party line must deny that China can have a Communist superstructure without an adequate base, and it must also deny that any country can develop socialism, "spontaneously," as a result of changes in the base and without aid from the superstructural Soviet state. The party line on superstructure and base is being strained to its limits, and revisionist arguments about the "atomic era" should find fertile ground. (For full text of the Tarsadalmi Szemle article, see Eastern Europe Press Survey (116)).

III. YUGOSLAVIA

Yugoslavs Refute Allegations in Soviet Article

Yugoslav Communist are quick to answer any attack on Yugoslavia particularly on the basis of revisionism published in the socialist camp. The latest such article appears in the party's Belgrade weekly, Komunist, on 9 June, in rebuttal of an anti-Yugoslav article in the Soviet Kommunist of 22 May. It sums up the Soviet article as a "well-known mixture of quasi-ideological positions which are not worth discussing (since our 'critics' neither wish nor conduct a principled ideological discussion) and political insinuations calculated to compromise Yugoslavia." The attacks on the economic and social progress of Yugoslavia and on its foreign policy, it says, "are intended to belittle the successes and to conceal them from the Soviet public and the public of the socialist camp."

Correcting what they term erroneous assertions concerning the Yugoslav economy, the editors stress that Yugoslavs "have always rejoiced over successes in other socialist countries." In their opinion, "the incorrect picture [in the Soviet article] of the situation in Yugoslavia is apparently necessary to show the public of the socialist countries as picturesquely as possible the fatal consequences of "Yugoslav revisionism" and (as the entire article clearly shows) the impossibility of building socialism outside the socialist camp."

The editors hold that the criticism of Yugoslav foreign policy has the same purpose; that is, to show that "socialism cannot be built outside the framework of the socialist camp and that socialism and the socialist camp are synonymous." Much is made of the point that Yugoslavia has offered active support to all the constructive proposals of the Soviet Union concerning

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

peace. The distortion of Yugoslav foreign policy is primarily for domestic consumption, say the editors, for "how would it look if the reader learned that Yugoslavia not only supports every constructive proposal of the Soviet Union but also has initiated many ideas and proposals which the Soviet government later adopted?"

It is stressed that the underlying theme of the discussion of "Yugoslav revisionism" in the field of international relations is that "who is not with us on every single point is against us." Followed to its logical conclusion, the editors say, this would mean that "everything socialist necessarily belongs in one camp and everything else in the other." In this connection, the editors quickly point out that "it is not difficult to guess how countries which do not belong to any bloc feel about such an attitude."

In answer to the charge that Yugoslav leaders have "leadership" ambitions at the international level, the editors submit that "this hue and cry is not against the danger of some Yugoslav pretensions to ideological monopoly, but rather against the unreadiness of Yugoslav Communists to submit to any such monopoly."

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Part 4. WESTERN EUROPE

I. DENMARK

Danish Dissident Communists Criticize Bucharest Declaration

Two things are clear concerning the ideological conflicts in the Communist world movement, writes K. M., a regular contributor, under the heading of "Peaceful Coexistence and Oracular Language Out of Bucharest," in the 8 July 1960 issue of SF, official weekly organ of Danish dissident Communist Aksel Larsen's Socialist People's Party. One is that quite profound differences of opinion on vital issues unquestionably exist; the other, that in the current, aggravated international situation, the most serious effort is devoted to finding a common denominator in the evaluation of the main features of the international situation. Outwardly, he notes, efforts are made to avoid an ideological debate and to maintain the semblance of ideologically uniform, "conflict-less" parties, a closely knit bloc of socialist states with a common approach to all the varied problems of the changing world and without ideological differences on basic principles -- "a relic of the undialectical method of the Stalin era, a departure from the tradition of classic Marxism."

K. M. charges that the search for a common denominator was the main preoccupation of the Communist Party representatives from all socialist countries who met in Bucharest in connection with the Congress of the Rumanian Workers Party. They evaded the issues, he says, and their approach to the "burning and controversial question" of the feasibility of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social and political systems was based not on an analysis of the immediate situation, but on the Declaration of Principles and the Peace Manifesto of the 1957 Conference of Communist Parties in Moscow. These K. M. says, quoting from the Bucharest communique, they found "completely valid in the present situation."

This statement, K. M. points out, is conspicuous for what it leaves unsaid, for what it evades; namely, the effect of modern atomic weapons on world developments, Kuusinen's strong speech of 22 April and the "differentiation process" in the Western World notwithstanding. "The thesis of the possibility of preventing war in our time is preserved, but it is as if greater weight is attributed to the danger of an imperialist aggressive war because of the continued existence of capitalism -- a typical feat of balance between, to put it mildly, Nikita Khrushchev's and Mao Tse-tung's slightly differently shaded conceptions of the main feature of our age."

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

With reference to peaceful or nonpeaceful transition to socialism, K. M. asserts, concrete analysis is again evaded and, in an effort to "join the sundered," the "oracular" language of the Bucharest pronouncement reaffirms the possibility of the peaceful road to socialism, but adds that it may also be necessary to envisage victory by nonpeaceful means; "they completely neglect even to conjecture where and under what economic, social, and political circumstances the probabilities indicate one or the other form of transition, whether under a bourgeois democracy in an industrially highly developed country with a strong socialist labor movement; under colonial, underdeveloped barbarism; or under a fascist, reactionary dictatorship."

Does this ambiguous language which gives no clear answer to the ideological debate of the times, he asks, mean that realistic clarity would expose ideological conflicts which might prove insurmountable?

II. FRANCE

Unified Socialist Party of France Attacked by Communist Official

An attack on the lack of unity of the Unified Socialist Party (PSU) on political or philosophical ideology, its anti-Communism, its attitude toward the USSR and the People's Democracies and toward Communist-Socialist unity of action, was contained in an article entitled "Dogmatism and Chatter" by Francois Billoux, member of the Politburo of the French Communist Party (PCF), in its weekly Paris organ France Nouvelle of 3 August 1960. The PSU includes Tribune de Communisme (Tribune of Communism) and other dissident Communist and Socialist groups.

Billoux began with a general attack on the PSU, its official weekly Tribune du Socialisme, and France Observateur and L'Express, all of which, he wrote, "continue to develop, under various forms, the theses of certain militants and tendencies of that party." He used the phrase "certain tendencies," he said, because "one of the characteristics of the PSU is that it is composed of people with very diverse political and philosophical concepts," who refuse to allow the party to be founded on a "unity of thought, a common ideology, especially Marxist theory." He claimed that each member of the PSU has his own ideas about socialism, and that many members do not believe socialism has anything to do with the "science of laws which regulate the development of society." They term as "dogmatic" everything that relates to the basic positions of Marxism-Leninism, he sneered, and issued the countercharge that the PSU itself is dogmatic because it refuses to acknowledge the existence of a socialist and an imperialist camp in the world.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

After asserting that the PSU leaders hurt not only themselves but also the working class and the democratic movement with their refusal to admit that there is a scientific basis to the development of society, Billoux singled out an article by Jean Verlhac, "The Day of 28 June and Its Lessons," in the 9 July 1960 issue of Tribune du Socialisme, to show that the PSU "ritualistically" accuses the PCF of dogmatism, asserting that it tries to prove its charge by quoting out of context, by presenting "fantastic" interpretations, and by repeating cliches. Billoux particularly criticized Verlhac for his contention that the PCF does not consider the Algerian war the main problem facing France today. The PCF has always fought for the right of the Algerian people to self-determination and for an end to the war, he wrote, but the Communists believe that it is the monopolies, not the Algerian war, which determine France's policy today.

Billoux further criticized Verlhac for dwelling on the "necessary coordination of activities" but refusing to accept the Communist theory of Communist-Socialist unity of action. "Only those who are not sure of their arguments and the correctness of their proposals can be afraid of submitting them to a decision of the masses," wrote Billoux. Renunciation of a Communist-Socialist united front, he contended, impedes the advancement of the Socialist workers.

In addition to criticizing Verlhac's position on Communist-Socialist unity of action "for the restoration and renovation of democracy," one of the PCF's main current propaganda lines, Billoux took him to task for his position on peaceful coexistence. The PSU leaders, like the SFIO (French Socialist Party) leaders, he claimed, do not consider the USSR and the People's Democracies as socialist countries. They judge the policies of those countries in the same way that they judge the policies of the capitalist countries, he said. They deny the existence of a socialist camp and a peace camp larger than a socialist camp, as well as the existence of an imperialist camp. Gilles Martinet's similar position on the two camps was also denounced by Billoux, who asserted that one cannot be opposed to one camp without serving the other. "The Communists have chosen to fight for peaceful coexistence and competition between the two camps, he said, "not only through a praiseworthy desire," but also because henceforth "war is avoidable." He repeated the current Soviet-supported theory that war is no longer inevitable, but added, "neither is peace. An unending fight must be carried on by the peoples to impose it...."

Billoux also criticized former Premier Mendes-France, a PSU member, particularly because of his record on Algeria, claiming that if the former Premier has changed his stand on Algeria it is because of united action on the part of the people:

Billoux concluded his article by strongly urging joint Communist-Socialist action which "remains a major trump for the triumph of a peace policy, liberty, and social progress."

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

III. ITALY

1. New Italian Revisionist Monthly Attacks PCI and PCF

The Italian revisionist monthly Corrispondenza Socialista which appeared in the first issue of March 1960, replaced the weekly newspaper of the same title published by Eugenio Reale for some 20,000 Italian ex-Communists. The new magazine, a self-styled "review of political criticism and documentation," is a source of revisionist essays which severely criticize the Italian Communist Party (PCI) and the Soviet system. Two appeared in the March issue: "The Ninth Congress of the PCI," by Antonio d'Ambrosio, and "Dogmatism and Revisionism in German Social Democracy," by Paolo Rossi. The May issue blamed the Communist Party of France (PCF) for ignoring salient facts concerning the Communist dissidents who have joined the new Unified Socialist Party of France.

In his report on the Ninth Congress of the PCI, d'Ambrosio scored the party, its directors, its secretary-general Palmiro Togliatti, and the Soviet system in 18 columns analyzing the congress under the following ten subheadings: (1) Relaxation According to the PCI; (2) Expectation of Economic Depression; (3) Atomic War and Rights of Peoples; (4) Communism and the Soviet Army; (5) Ambiguity; (6) Monopolies and Middle Classes; (7) The Peasants; (8) Workers Conditions; (9) International Policy; and (10) Relaxation. In essence, d'Ambrosio said that the Ninth Congress indulged in much useless talk and did not make the least effort to change the basic aspects of the party program, but only masked itself to condition the Italian executive branch of government so that the party might enter the cabinet, drive out the other parties one by one, and seize unlimited power; that for this great act of deception the PCI would rely on the incautious good faith of other political parties and movements with poor memories. Italian Communists, said d'Ambrosio, cannot become democrats unless they revise their program and review critically the history of the international Communist movement, which is exactly what they do not dare to do and what the present directors of the party will never consent to have done by others.

From the economic, political, and social viewpoints, certain descriptions of domestic conditions and certain comparisons made by Togliatti and other party directors between conditions in Italy and those in the Soviet Orbit were variously labeled by author d'Ambrosio as made in bad faith or as shortsighted. The author ridiculed Togliatti for one such comparison, relating specifically to wages in Italy and the USSR, by referring to a contradictory report on the same subject by Luigi Longo, deputy secretary-general of the PCI.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

The Ninth Congress was convinced that Communist power is about to become dominant, and yet the party is afraid to look outside itself; it tries to fit the facts of Italian existence to Lenin's old design, and therefore there is constant worry in party circles over any attempt to inquire, anger at heresy, and hate for revisionism, d'Ambrosio wrote. The height of self-deceit is reached in portraying splendid relationships between various Communist governments and colonial peoples, he noted. Speaking more assertively for revisionists, he denied the fatal nature of economic depression and its inseparability from the capitalist system, and stated that the "imperialist nature of Italian capitalism" broadcast by Italian Communists is a gross exaggeration. The Ninth Congress attacked Italian private monopolies in a manner which proved ignorance of their real nature, d'Ambrosio noted, because, in his opinion, a Soviet-type economy is the ultimate monopoly, killing private entrepreneurs who resist socialization under a Communist regime but promising through the PCI that anyone in Italy may own and run his own business when the PCI comes to executive power, a promise made in bad faith. This congress failed to clarify the PCI's relationship to the USSR; in fact, said revisionist d'Ambrosio, Italian Communist leaders have not yet stopped talking about the "merits" of Joseph Stalin.

The congress held its sessions in chilling boredom except for the ovation given to Hungarian delegate Marosan, according to d'Ambrosio, who saw in this welcome an a priori approval of the execution of 150 young Hungarians for their part in the Revolution of 1956, regardless of the horror expressed in the Free World press on the day before the cheers for Morosan.

In the article titled "Dogmatism and Revisionism in German Social Democracy," Rossi castigated the resistance of Communism to every revisionist movement and its antipathy to and suspicion of Communists who would re-examine Marxism-Leninism in the light of new conditions. As a corollary to this theme of Communist resistance to social democracy in West Germany, Rossi charged that the Italian Socialist Party, led by Pietro Nenni, has made some weak efforts to separate itself from PCI influence, but that it still accepts the dogmatic spirit and theological method of the PCI.

In the May issue of Corrispondenza Socialista, Roberto Macchi berated the French Communist Party in connection with Tribune of Communism, dissident Communist component of the new Unified Socialist Party (PSU) of France. Macchi remarked that the PCF carefully avoided praise of the new Unified Socialists, and that the former's reservations were evident between the lines of the official PCF daily l'Humanite. For example, he said, l'Humanite did not mention the presence of the Tito delegation, or the speech by Perovtich, a member of the central committee of the Yugoslav League of Communists, at the PSU's founding congress. The newspaper also omitted the names of recent Communist Party dissidents who now represent Tribune of

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Communism on the national committee of the PSU, including Jean Poperon, who in 1957 wrote for Cahiers du Communisme, PCF theoretical journal. Among the founders of the PSU who are not controlled from the Kremlin is Laurent Schwarz, professor at the Sorbonne and chairman of the Maurice Audin Committee, Macchi pointed out.

2. Revisionist Giolitti Edits Book on Communism in Europe

Antonio Giolitti, former Italian Communist deputy to Parliament and now an Italian Socialist Party (PSI) deputy, has edited II Comunismo in Europa (Communism in Europe), a compilation of official documents of the international Communist movement, excerpted writings of 14 Communist authors, and his own introduction and comment. The PSI daily Avanti! of Rome reviewed Giolitti's latest politicoliterary effort in its issue of 27 July 1960 over the signature of Luciano Vasconi. The reviewer said that Giolitti essentially examined the period from 1945 to the present, and that the Communist writers represented are Dimitrov, Gomulka, Kardelj, Khrushchev, Lenin, Malenkov, Manuilskiy, Nagy, Stalin, Thorez, Tito, Togliatti, Trotsky, and Zhdanov.

The newspaper review of II Comunismo in Europa quoted from Giolitti's introduction, in which he translated the Italian Communist usage of "duplicité" as meaning "the contradictory coexistence of two policies and two outlooks." According to Giolitti, the contradictions which have appeared in recent years between various Communist movements, such as the Chinese and Soviet, concerning world relaxation and a long-lasting peace are not the result of different degrees of maturity, but seem to reflect a deep and perhaps unresolvable conflict between Communist strategy and tactics. Communist strategy, Giolitti wrote, is directed toward the conquest of power by any means, whereas its tactics are aimed at understanding whatever has appeared valid in the legacy from the old world. Reviewer Vasconi reported that in an article published in Rinascita, theoretical journal of the Italian Communist Party, party leader Togliatti, writing as "Roderigo," refuted Giolitti's interpretation of Communist strategic and tactical contradiction and attempted to correct Giolitti's phrase "provisional alignment" by substituting "transitional alignment."

Giolitti made an assessment of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the review said, measuring its ideological limitation in terms of the "bigoted formula" of the "personality cult." He characterized the secret report as "more important than the public one," and thus detoured "onto a false road the criticism of Stalinism, obstructing the process of revisionism which had just begun." According to the review, Giolitti continued, "That formula was to act as a lightning rod to attract to 'personality' all the critical charge which necessarily struck at the system, and thus absorb and neutralize it." He suggested instead that

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

"the more convincing and compelling way" was "a criticism of Stalinism which would not have hesitated to go back to its deepest and most tenacious ideological roots, would have had the courage to avoid justification in historic dialectic, and would have filled the fearful gap between means and ends, politics and truth."

For Giolitti, the review said, the two faces of Communism are not clear to itself: The choice between the Soviet model and national roads to Communism; and, within the party, the fact that war Communism and a policy of broad consumption are at odds.

* * *

Approved For Release 2000/09/14 : CIA-RDP78-00915R001200120002-3

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2000/09/14 : CIA-RDP78-00915R001200120002-3